

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and arguments presented herein.

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-13 and 18-26 are amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Support for the amendments can be found at least on pages 16, 19, and 20 of the application.

§ 101 Rejections

According to the Office Action, Claims 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that, as amended, Claims 20-26 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

§ 103 Rejections

According to the Office Action, Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,937,743 (“Rassman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,208,765 (“Turnbull”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rassman nor Turnbull nor the combination thereof teaches or suggests “indicia coding components in the plurality of components to indicate redundancy in the plurality of components” as recited in independent Claim 1, “a code segment that modifies the pictorial representation of the existing system to include indicia coding that associates the plurality of components with vendors that provide products and services associated with the plurality of components to provide a visual display of the products and services offered by each of the vendors” as recited in independent Claim 7, “logic for indicia coding components in the plurality of

components to indicate redundancy in the plurality of components” as recited in independent Claim 13, and/or “displaying indicia coding that associates components with vendors that provide products and services associated with the components to provide a visual display of the products and services offered by each of the vendors” as recited in independent Claim 20.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references are silent with regard to the specific features recited above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Rassman and Turnbull do not show or suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 7, 13, and 20, and that those claims are in condition for allowance.

Each of the Claims 2-6 and 19 includes all of the features of Claim 1 plus additional features. Each of the Claims 8-12 includes all of the features of independent Claim 7 plus additional features. Each of the Claims 14-18 includes all of the features of independent Claim 13 plus additional features. Each of the Claims 21-26 includes all of the features of independent Claim 20 plus additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that Rassman and Turnbull do not show or suggest the features of Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-19, and 21-26 in combination with the features of their respective base claim, and that Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-19, and 21-26 are in condition for allowance at least because they depend from an allowable claim.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-26 traverse the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusions

Applicants respectfully assert that all claims are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner. The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO HAO & BARNES

Dated: October 8, 2010

/William A. Zarbis/

William A. Zarbis
Registration No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

(408) 938-9080 Ext. 113